UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,145	07/26/2001	Hironobu Takagi	JP920000237US1	2731

877 7590 06/09/2004

IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER
P.O. BOX 218
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER	
MANIWANG, JOSEPH R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2144	6

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/682,145	TAKAGI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph R Maniwang	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 September 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to prior art documents in paragraphs [0007] and [0009] is improper because hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser executable code cannot be incorporated by reference. See MPEP § 608.01. Because of the inherently transient nature of URL addresses, the attempt to incorporate subject matter into the patent application by reference to a hyperlink and/or other forms of browser-executable code is considered to be an improper incorporation by reference. See MPEP § 608.01(p), paragraph I regarding incorporation by reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 recites the limitations "the list title", "the side of table", and "the form". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 20 recites the limitations "the list title", "the side of table", and "the form". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14-18, 20-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sweet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,278), hereinafter referred to as Sweet.

Regarding claims 1, 14, and 24, Sweet disclosed a method and system for simplifying web documents comprising acquiring a target page, acquiring adjoining pages, and deleting objects common to the target and adjoining pages to generate a simplified page as claimed (see column 4, line 46 through column 5, line 7; column 8, lines 45-67; column 11, lines 18-62).

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Sweet disclosed acquiring adjoining pages by retrieving pages in a common directory, server, or that refer to the target document (see column 5, lines 19-30; column 10, lines 8-23; column 11, lines 1-8).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Sweet disclosed determining past pages in acquiring adjoining pages as claimed (see column 11, lines 18-42).

Regarding claims 4, 5, and 17, Sweet disclosed prioritizing adjoining pages by forming a URL list, the list determined by co-occurrence between previously retrieved URLs and adjoining URLs (see column 10, lines 1-7; column 11, lines 1-6, 24-29).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Sweet disclosed the use of matching for determining if an object was previously incorporated into a target document (see column 11, lines 43-56).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Sweet disclosed a post-processing step for adjusting the margins of the page, thus disclosing restoration of information at the top or side of the page (see column 13, lines 1-19).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, the simplified page generated in the system of Sweet was generated and sent to a user upon receiving a request from a user as claimed (see column 8, lines 20-35).

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Sweet disclosed the use of a terminal with a small display screen as claimed (see column 16, lines 16-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,278), hereinafter referred to as Sweet, as applied

to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Nishizawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,537,325), hereinafter referred to as NIshizawa.

Sweet disclosed a method and system for simplifying web documents comprising acquiring a target page, acquiring adjoining pages, and deleting objects common to the target and adjoining pages to generate a simplified page as claimed (see column 4, line 46 through column 5, line 7; column 8, lines 45-67; column 11, lines 18-62).

While Sweet disclosed checking for and deleting objects common between pages to avoid redundancy, Sweet did not disclose calculating the significance of the objects and deleting them only if the significance was below a predetermined threshold, wherein calculating the significance was represented by the sum of weighted featured values.

In a related art of document processing, Nishizawa disclosed a method and system for generating a summarized document from an original document. The routine for creating the summarized page included calculating the significance of a word, where the word was considered significant if it passed a certain threshold value (see column 5, line 61 through column 6, line 11). Furthermore, Nishizawa disclosed summing weighted feature values of the words to determine significance (see column 6, lines 15-49; column 9, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the system of Sweet to include the provision for calculating the significance of an object as taught by Nishizawa. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so as the teachings of Nishizawa provided a simple, effective document summarization

process that produced more relevant output (see column 2, lines 21-35). This would have benefited the invention of Sweet, as common objects were deleted with little discretion and pages were generated based more on the form of the document. Nishizawa recognized a lack of effectiveness in such systems (see column 1, lines 54-64), and offered calculating significance as a solution.

Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,278), hereinafter referred to as Sweet, as applied to claims 11 and 21 above, and further in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0164000), hereinafter referred to as Cohen.

Sweet disclosed a method and system for simplifying web documents comprising acquiring a target page, acquiring adjoining pages, and deleting objects common to the target and adjoining pages to generate a simplified page as claimed (see column 4, line 46 through column 5, line 7; column 8, lines 45-67; column 11, lines 18-62). The simplified page generated in the system of Sweet was generated and sent to a user upon receiving a request from a user as claimed (see column 8, lines 20-35). Pages were acquired through the Internet in a well-known fashion using a computer and a browser (see column 8, lines 6-20).

While Sweet disclosed the use of a browser to obtain pages through the Internet, Sweet did not specifically disclose inputting requests by voice and receiving output pages by voice.

In a related art of Internet browsing, Cohen disclosed a method and system for browsing the Internet through voice. Cohen disclosed a system in which both typical input requests and output documents were done in voice (see paragraphs [0011], [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sweet and Cohen to provide a system for simplifying Internet documents capable of using voice for inputting requests from the user and outputting pages to the user as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider the teachings of Cohen because the voice system described by Cohen not only provided access to the Internet through a conventional phone thus increasing network accessibility, but also overcame the requirement to know a specific telephone number or URL, making access to an Internet page easier (see paragraph [0012]).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rowe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,785) disclosed a method and system providing an optimized page-based electronic document.

Berstis (U.S. Pat. No. 6,718,015) disclosed a system for browsing the Internet with a telephone.

Rhie et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,366,650) disclosed accessing the Internet through a telephone using DTMF signals.

Siegel (U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,523) disclosed a method for navigating textual information using auditory signals.

Dean et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,665,837) disclosed a method for identifying related pages in a linked plurality of pages on the Internet.

Kloba et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,412) disclosed a method and system for the aggregation of web content for delivery to mobile device clients.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R Maniwang whose telephone number is (703) 305-3179. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A Cuchlinski can be reached on (703)308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM

WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100